

CONCLUSIONS

338. The consultation process has been inadequate for a number of reasons including:

- Insufficient information provided or in some cases, following requests for additional information, denied.
- Insufficient independent information such as fleet mix and surface access assumptions which have been provided by the aviation industry itself.
- Inadequate public consultation limited to the 57db noise contour when it is known that annoyance is caused to residents that are well below this level.
- Outcome of the third runway consultation is already pre-determined plus consultees' questions are biased.

Government should address these issues and re-consult.

339. The whole issue of expansion at Heathrow should be re-assessed now the potential impact is so much greater than at the time of the Aviation White Paper in 2003:

- Loss of 700 homes,
- air quality; noise
- water,
- biodiversity,
- community cohesion,
- heritage
- mixed mode,
- 6th Terminal,
- new roads,
- longer runway

Government should address these issues and re-assess Heathrow expansion in comparison with less damaging expansion at other airport locations in South East England.

340. The Aviation White Paper's 3 environmental tests have not been met. Key evidence has been denied, insufficient sensitivity testing has been performed on assumptions used, no account has been taken of future meteorological conditions, the air quality model is under-predicting, over-optimistic assumptions have been made on key inputs. Government have not proved that they can be confident of meeting the EU air pollution limits.

341. Surface Access has simply been "dropped" yet the projected congestion is overwhelming, not just on the roads but on public transport.

342. Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment is wholly inadequate. Climate change impacts will not be mitigated by any of the measures indicated in the document, whilst the weight of environmental costs totally outweigh the economic benefits which are mainly to users of the airport (passengers and airport operator, airlines and associated businesses).

343. The rationale for expansion is based upon flawed economic arguments. The Government must address this key issue before any further decisions are taken on expansion at Heathrow. No independent peer review has ever been undertaken on this aspect. This is totally unacceptable given the vast impacts on Hillingdon and the majority of London and surrounding areas while the sole benefit is the claimed economic advantage.

344. The ANASE study has been discounted despite clear evidence that noise nuisance is now much more annoying for residents than previously thought.

345. The folly of inserting an equivalent of Gatwick Airport into Greater London, where its noise would impact on hundreds of thousands of residents, must be halted.